



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,292	03/26/2004	Peter Davis	1048 022 301 0202	9263
37211	7590	09/11/2006	EXAMINER	
BASCH & NICKERSON LLP			HONG, JOHN C	
1777 PENFIELD ROAD			ART UNIT	
PENFIELD, NY 14526			PAPER NUMBER	

3726

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,292

Applicant(s)

DAVIS ET AL.

Examiner

John C. Hong

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-14 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-18 in the reply filed on 6/29/06 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the restriction requirement is not proper since some apparatus claims do not specially recite rollers. This is not found persuasive because Independent apparatus claims 1 and 10 contain the limitations of "a plurality of rollers" and "a plurality of roller alignment". These limitations are not claimed in the method claims 19 and 20.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 7-12, 14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rachkov et al. (US Patent No. 6,681,481) in view of Edwards (US Patent No. 3,387,906). In regard to claim 1, Rachkov et al. disclose the following:

A releasable, sliding mount for connecting a component feeding system to an assembly machine in a repeatable manner (figure 1, 10), comprising: a feeder platform (12) attached to the assembly machine; a docking channel (16) operatively affixed to the feeder platform (12), said docking channel including a pair of parallel grooves therein (column 3 line 66-column 4, line 2); a positioning member (Figure 3, 36) associated with a docking channel.

Art Unit: 3726

Rachkov et al. fail to teach the use of a guide rail but fail to teach the use of rollers for inserting the component-feeding machine into the docking channel.

However, Edwards, teaches a plurality of rollers (figures 5 and 6, 34 and 36) used for the reciprocal motion of a component. The rollers are received by grooves (grooves formed by surfaces 81,83,82 and 84 in figure 6) in a docking channel (14). The purpose of using rollers or wheels to move an object is to reduce friction between the component being moved, and the surface it is moving upon. This reduction in friction makes for easier reciprocal motion.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the rollers of Edwards in the sliding mount of Rachkov et al. in order to create a much smoother insertion and retraction of the component.

In regard to claims 2, and 7-9,11,17 and 18, Rachkov et al. disclose locking the component feeding system in a defined position using a positioning member (figures 2 and 3, 36).

The positioning member contains a bracket (figure 3,32), a latch pin (figure 3, 62) inserted in 38; can also be called a latching mechanism) to control the inward position and relative motion of the component feeding system, and an alignment pin(48) for further alignment and positioning control.

Regarding claims 3 and 12, Rachkov et al. disclose a safety stop (figures 2 and 3, 40) for preventing the inadvertent removal of the component feeding system from the docking channel (column 4, lines 52-54), wherein said safety stop is displaced so as to allow the component feeding system to be completely removed from the docking channel (column 5, lines 12-14).

Art Unit: 3726

In regard to claims 4 and 14, Rachkov et al. disclose the docking channel having a base plate (figure 1, 12) and at least two vertical members (areas in between slots 16 extend vertically).

Regarding claim 10, all of the claimed information is addressed above paragraphs. Furthermore, Rachkov et al. teach a plurality of docking channels (figure 1, 16; column 3 lines 48-49) capable of receiving a plurality of component feeding systems.

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rachkov et al. (US Patent No. 6,681,481) in view of Edwards (US Patent No. 3,387,906) and further in view of AAPA (Applicants Admitted Prior Art).

Rachkov et al. /Edwards teach all of the claimed information, yet fail to teach a plurality of "types" of component feeding systems being used on the mounting device.

However, Rachkov et al. disclose a mounting device for a micro-device feeder. Furthermore, Rachkov et al. disclose a plurality of docking channels for a plurality of micro-device feeders. APA teaches that there are many different types of micro-device feeders such as DDFs (Direct Die Feeders) and tape and reel feeders. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize a plurality of "types" of component feeding systems, as taught by AAPA on the mounting device of Rachkov et al./ Edwards in order to accommodate a plurality of different types of component feeding systems.

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 3726

5. Claims 5, 6, and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 6/29/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See the new Office action. Regarding the argument on the combination of rollers and receiving grooves, as taught by Edwards with the device of Rackov et al., It has been considered that reducing frictions which is the problem of the same fields, is solved by the utilization of rollers and receiving grooves.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3726

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John C. Hong whose telephone number is 571-272-4529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(07:00-16:30)First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on 571-272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



John C. Hong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3726

jh
September 2, 2006